

REMARKS

Applicants have the following response to the Office Action of January 18, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

- A. Claims 1-4, 6, 30, 31 and 59 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Koyama (U.S. 6,730,966).
- B. Claims 1-4, 6, 30, 31 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada (U.S. 6,246,179).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the feature that “the anode extends in a first direction, and each of the first end portion and the second end portion of the anode extends along the first direction”, and “at least one wiring formed over and in contact with the first end portion of the anode, wherein the wiring extends in the first direction”. These features are shown, for example, in Figs. 1A and 1C of the present application.

Neither Koyama nor Yamada appear to disclose or suggest a wiring and an anode extending in the same direction, and in particular, do not appear to disclose or suggest the above-claimed features with regard to the wiring and the anode.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Koyama or Yamada, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 13-16, 18, 32-37, 49-56 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13-16, 18, 32-37, 49-56 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya (U.S. 6,380,673) in view of Beesely et al. (U.S. 5,400,047) in view of Terao et al. (U.S. 6,133,581). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claims 13, 34 and 49 to recite that a first wiring and a second wiring are formed over and in contact with an end portion of the anode (the claims no longer recites first wiring and second wiring interposed between the insulator and the anode), and to recite “an insulating film covering both edge portions of the anode along the first direction and the first wiring and the second wiring, wherein the insulating film has a planarized surface over the both edge portions of the anode and the first wiring and the second wiring”.¹ These features are also supported by, for example, Figs. 1A and 1C of the present application.

In contrast, Seikya, Beesely and Terao do not disclose or suggest an insulating film covering both edge portions of the anode along the first direction and the wiring, wherein the insulating film has a planarized surface over the both edge portions of the anode and the wiring.

Therefore, independent Claims 13, 34 and 49 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 13, 34 and 49 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

¹ Independent Claim 1 has been amended in a similar manner.

Claims 39, 40-42, 44-47, 57 and 58

The Examiner also rejects Claims 39, 40-42, 44-47, 57 and 58 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya in view of Beesely et al. and further in view of Terao and further in view of Yokoi et al. (U.S. 5,962,970). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claims 39 and 44 to recite wherein each of the first stick driver and the second stick driver comprises a thin film transistor. This feature is supported by, for example, page 9, lines 2-8 of the specification of the present application.

In contrast, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a stick driver comprising a thin film transistor.

Therefore, independent Claims 39 and 44 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 39 and 44 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 38, 43 and 48

The Examiner also rejects Claims 38, 43 and 48 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekiya in view of Beesely in further view of Terao, in further view of Yokoi, in further view of Codama et al. (U.S. 6,037,712). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 18, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568